

Remarks/Arguments:

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed October 28, 2008. Claims 1-66 were pending in the Application prior to the outstanding Office Action. In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-66. The present Response amends claims 1, 18, 33, and 50; and add new claim 68, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration claims 1-66 and 68. Reconsideration of the rejections is requested.

I. Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-16, 18-31, 33-48, and 50-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. in view of Alcorn et al, further in view of Saidenberg et al..

Claims 17, 32, 49, and 66 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chowdhry et al. in view of Alcorn et al, further in view of Saidenberg et al., further in view of Flesner et al.

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to include the feature of “*wherein the second user interface displays a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality of content selectors.*”

On the other hand, Chowdhry provides only a specific view of a portal based on the characteristics of a visitor to a site.

Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious that a content selector hierarchy that contains a plurality content selectors is displayed.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 1, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 68

Claim 68 includes the feature of “*wherein a context-sensitive editor is used to contain and edit rule definition of a selected content selector, wherein the rule definition of the selected content selector includes natural language phrases that are highlighted to be changed to new values that are appropriate for a given phrase’s semantic attributes.*”

Applicant respectfully submits that Chowdhry and other prior arts do not teach or make obvious the context-sensitive editor that can edit rule definition of a selected content selector using highlighted natural language phrases.

In view of the above comments, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 68, as amended, is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 18, 33 and 50

Claims 18, 33 and 50, while independently patentable, recite limitations that similarly to Claim 1 are not disclosed nor rendered obvious by the cited references. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-17, 19-32, 34-49, and 51-66

Claims 2-17, 19-32, 34-49, and 51-66 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim, and further in view of the comments provided above.

It is also submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

II. Conclusion

In light of the above, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and a Notice of Allowance is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting the issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 24, 2008

By: /Kuiran (Ted) Liu/
Kuiran (Ted) Liu
Reg. No. 60,039

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800